**Reading Guide for Israel Scheffler’s *In Praise of Cognitive Emotions*.**

**Background.** Israel Scheffler is a philosopher who taught at Harvard for forty years, retiring in 1992. He mainly taught courses in epistemology (philosophy of knowledge), philosophy of science, and philosophy of education.

Scheffler was educated at a time when what is called ‘analytical philosophy’ was the main focus of the discipline. A key strategy that analytical philosophers use to approach philosophical questions is to analyze the language being used in arguments. So, for example, with philosophy of science issues, an analytical philosopher would look carefully at the definitions of scientific terms like hypothesis, explanation, or evidence, and their logical relationships.

For this reason, you will notice even on the first page of the article, that Scheffler tries to clearly define key terms he wants to use in his argument: cognition, emotion, reductive, for example. A good example of this can be found in the last paragraph at the bottom of page 148.

**Style issues:** In this article, you may feel that the construction of the sentences seems a little stilted. Or in some cases the sentences are complicated. In many cases the vocabulary is sophisticated.

*Suggestion*: It’s not necessary to be familiar with all the words in this article. However, if there are sentences you can’t understand because of the words, I would suggest having a dictionary available to look them up.

**Use of thesis sentences followed by examples**: Many of the sections in this article are organized around a series of thesis sentences followed by examples from experience that illustrate (and are meant to support) the thesis. Look at examples of this rhetorical strategy in the last paragraph of page 140. *Hint*: If you find it difficult to understand the thesis sentences, study the concrete examples and see if that helps.

**Concentrated ideas:** Even though he uses concrete examples in his writing, he tends not to dwell for a long time on each sub-thesis. You may have to re-read sections and think about the examples in order to understand his claims, step-by-step. This is particularly the case for final two paragraphs of the article. These paragraphs summarize the relationship between cognition and emotion in the pursuit of truth using the scientific method or critical thinking. Do not worry if you cannot follow all the details of the points he is making—the vocabulary is particularly dense here. I have read the paragraphs several times and still am not sure if I understand them completely. Just enjoy the sense of the rhythmic relationship between rational thought and emotions that he is summarizing.

**They say/I say:** The purpose of this reading is to present a view that contrasts with Korab-Kaprowicz’s *Knowing Beyond Science: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It* . For the purposes of your paper, “they say” refers to what is presented in the two articles.

However within his own article, notice that Scheffler uses two ‘they say’ strategies to depict the conversation he is entering with the article. The first strategy is footnotes that reference writings by other philosophers with whom he either agrees or disagrees. The second is commenting on substantial quotes. *Hint*: For each quote, find evidence of whether he agrees or disagrees with it, or whether there is some combination of the two.

**Thesis development**: Schefller saves his most important thesis about ‘surprise’ as a cognitive emotion, for the end of the article. It’s important is indicated by the amount of text he devotes to it, and also by the fact that after he states the main thesis (in the middle of page 152), he goes on to develop a series of sub-theses about it in the following paragraphs. As you read these sub-theses concerning the acceptance or rejection of surprise, reflect on your own life experience and those of friends and family and see if you can find your own examples for each type of response to surprise.